

Message

---

**From:** Sengco, Mario [Sengco.Mario@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 5/12/2020 3:22:01 PM  
**To:** Fleisig, Erica [Fleisig.Erica@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Wilcut, Lars [Wilcut.Lars@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** FW: Question from ND re: Ammonia Standard

Response from Holly and Peter

Mario

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 12, 2020 10:48 AM  
**To:** Sengco, Mario <Sengco.Mario@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Question from ND re: Ammonia Standard

Thanks Mario, yes the delayed effective date sounds like a good option for ND. I was thinking about something along the lines of a variance until the facility upgrades were complete.

I did hear back from Pete Wax this morning. He said he's not sure what will happen in the end, but his plan is to amend the standards without a site-specific standard for Fargo. That would require them to meet the 2013 recommended criteria for fresh water with mussels but no salmonids.

He said he's been in contact with the folks in his permits program and Marty (the permits program supervisor - we met him at Salt Lake City at the state and tribal meeting) believes Fargo can meet the new numbers. I do really like your and Erica's idea for the delayed effective date. I'll mention it to Pete.

Thanks so much!

Holly

---

**From:** Sengco, Mario <Sengco.Mario@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 12, 2020 6:37 AM  
**To:** Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Question from ND re: Ammonia Standard

Thanks, Holly. Erica mentioned that in NV the state is proposing to adopt our selenium 304a but with a 3-year delayed effective date just for one particular water where they want to have enough time to develop a site-specific criterion. Would that maybe work here in ND? That is adopt the ammonia criteria everywhere except for the Red River in Fargo, but have a delayed effective date until the State can do the site-specific criteria for Fargo? Just a thought.

Mario

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday <[wirick.holiday@epa.gov](mailto:wirick.holiday@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 11, 2020 6:30 PM  
**To:** Sengco, Mario <[Sengco.Mario@epa.gov](mailto:Sengco.Mario@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Question from ND re: Ammonia Standard

Thanks Mario. I'm not sure what the plan is for Red River, but I'll check with Pete and get back to you.

Thanks so much for your help on this.

---

**From:** Sengco, Mario <[Sengco.Mario@epa.gov](mailto:Sengco.Mario@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 11, 2020 2:37 PM  
**To:** Wirick, Holiday <[wirick.holiday@epa.gov](mailto:wirick.holiday@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Question from ND re: Ammonia Standard

Hi Holly

Lars is looking at the document. He's the lead on ammonia right now. Karen is not working on it currently.

Erica asked a question. For the Red River, are we to assume these new/revised ammonia criteria would not apply to Fargo and would the old ammonia criteria apply if there is no site-specific criteria?

Thanks,

Mario

---

**From:** Wirick, Holiday <[wirick.holiday@epa.gov](mailto:wirick.holiday@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 08, 2020 2:08 PM  
**To:** Sengco, Mario <[Sengco.Mario@epa.gov](mailto:Sengco.Mario@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Question from ND re: Ammonia Standard

Hi Mario I hope all is well.

Pete Wax from North Dakota Dept. of Environmental Quality is working on the state's next triennial and is exploring options for adopting EPA's 2013 ammonia criteria.

It sounds promising. Apparently, mussels have been found all over the state and it seems the permitting folks are on board with Pete's plans to move ahead, and the next step is working to convince management.

Pete has a question about the attached revised equations (in blue). He asked if the tables assume that all waters in the state have mussels, does he need the "salmonids present" equation, or any additional equations based on pH of 7 and lower temperatures?

Pete said in previous correspondence that there's a better chance of finding a hippopotamus in ND's waters than salmonids.

Pete also asked me to review the revised equations to make sure they're properly populated.

Since this is my first rodeo with ammonia criteria, do you think I should get in touch with Karen Kessler about Pete's question and revised equations?

Thanks - and have a fun, productive, and musical weekend.

Holly Wirick  
Water Quality Section  
U.S. EPA - Region 8  
303-312-6238

---

**From:** Wax, Peter N. <[pwax@nd.gov](mailto:pwax@nd.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 8, 2020 7:56 AM  
**To:** Wirick, Holiday <[wirick.holiday@epa.gov](mailto:wirick.holiday@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Ammonia Standard

Dear Holly:

Hope spring has sprung in Colorado and you are healthy and covid free. I am working from home.

STANDARDS: Working on Table 2 in ND's standards and I am a bit unsure of the proper equations for Ammonia. If I use the two included and assume all waters have mussels, do I need the salmonids present one and any additional equations based on pH of 7 and lower temperatures. If so, could you help me ensure that this table is populated correctly.

The table 2 with Blue is new the table 2 with Red is old. When I am sure of the equations, I will rewrite them larger in a different program but for now I just need to know they are correct as intended and inclusive.

Note that in the new table there is no site-specific criteria for Fargo on the Red River. With some upgrades they can make the new criteria. Upgrading will be expensive. Fargo is the largest and most politically powerful community in ND. While I hope not, there is a possibility that a new "site-specific criteria" will need to be calculated. At that point I will be leaning on for additional help.

Note, my work number (701-328-5268) rings at my home. Leave a message if I do not pick up - running to the office and back can take a couple hours and I will make a few trips a week.

Sincerely,

Pete

Peter N. Wax  
Special Projects  
Division of Water Quality

701.328.5268 • [pwax@nd.gov](mailto:pwax@nd.gov) • <https://deq.nd.gov/>

